

## **Historic, archived document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.





United States  
Department of  
Agriculture

Office of  
Public Affairs

# **Selected Speeches and News Releases**

**November 22 - November 29, 1990**

## **IN THIS ISSUE:**

### **News Releases—**

USDA Creates Artificial Wetlands to Treat Acid Mine Drainage

National Hearing on Federal Milk Orders Concludes

Fungus Gets EPA Approval as New Biocontrol for Two Serious Plant Diseases

Yeutter Announces 45 Water Quality Projects

USDA Announces Prevailing World Market Rice Prices

“Nosy” Beagle Blocks Forbidden Fruit Mailed from Hawaii

USDA Proposes Revising Standards for Bulk American Cheese

USDA Releases Cost of Food at Home for October

This Week’s Honey-Loan Repayment Levels Unchanged



# News Releases

---

U.S. Department of Agriculture • Office of Public Affairs

---

## USDA CREATES ARTIFICIAL WETLANDS TO TREAT ACID MINE DRAINAGE

WASHINGTON—Your mental image of acid mine drainage may include a stream of yellow-red water, streaked with lines of oily gold or mustard colored ripples, slowly moving through a clearing of rock formations in an area generally denuded of vegetation and showing signs of serious erosion.

But because the U.S. Department of Agriculture is creating artificial wetlands to treat that form of water pollution, you might instead describe the situation with the phrase “visibly improved.”

The Stearns Ranger District in the Daniel Boone National Forest in central Kentucky is one of the sites in which USDA’s Forest Service is experimenting with artificial wetlands.

Gary Coleman, a Forest Service lands/water/minerals staff officer with the Forest in Winchester, KY, said that traditional methods of treating such sites have relied on neutralizing the acid in the water through adding an alkaline substance, aeration of the water, treatment in a retention pond, and blocking entrances of mine tunnels to prevent seepage of acid mine water.

However, such methods are costly—with estimates from the U.S. Bureau of Mines running at more than one million dollars per day for chemical treatment alone.

“So we came up with a biological treatment of acid mine drainage which relies on using artificial wetlands—and which we think will be as effective, but less expensive, in the long run,” he said.

One of the “key players” in biological treatment of acid mine drainage is the cattail. They are one of the most commonly used plants in creating an artificial wetland since they seem to have a natural capacity for removing metals from the water. Additional plants which show a similar capacity include bullrushes and horsetails.

Coleman said that the experiment, called the Jones Branch Artificial Wetland Project, includes 25 small ponds or “cells,” each measuring about 20 ft. by 20 ft., and covering about one-fourth of an acre, or 11,000 square feet.



Forest Service engineers constructed, within each pond, a nine-inch-thick layer of crushed limestone on top of a graded, compacted floor of clay that minimizes seepage. They then placed an 18-inch layer of mushroom compost, obtained from local mushroom beds, which provided the organic growing medium.

“Once the organic matter was in place and leveled, we planted the cattails,” Coleman said.

This newly-constructed artificial wetland was then watered. “We started out with unpolluted water,” he said, “to allow the plants to recover from the stress of being transplanted.”

Up to this point, the acid mine drainage was being held back by such controlling devices as a metal and fiberglass dam-like “gate” and a wooden flume. However, the FS research scientists then released the acid mine water into the wetland at a rate that would allow the plants to gradually become tolerant of the acidic water.

Howard Halverson, project leader of FS’s Research Station in Berea, KY, said that the metals in the mine drainage water slowly get removed, in the artificial wetland, through naturally-occurring filtration, absorption by organic substances and plants, and other biological processes.

Forest Service research scientists began using its artificial wetland in the summer of 1989. Nearly 18 months later, initial assessments are that the project has achieved about a 90 percent reduction in total dissolved solids such as metals and a 98 percent drop in total sulfates.

The drop in iron levels fluctuated from 55 percent to 100 percent in the winter and summer months, respectively. This was because cold temperatures reduce the effectiveness of the plants to absorb minerals and also slow down the biological activity of the microbes in the organic substances. Halverson said the artificial wetlands are not maintenance-free. “They need periodic maintenance to remove minerals and metals that have been deposited in the wetlands,” he said. “Plus, they need periodic inspections to monitor water levels—since water levels are very critical to allow proper plant growth.”

He said that a number of concerns remain unanswered so far—such as what are the long-term construction and maintenance costs, who pays for all of this, and will state or local governments provide for bonds or other monetary incentives to finance the creation of artificial wetlands.

“But the positive side,” Halverson said, “is that by reducing heavy metals and other pollutants associated with acid mine drainage, you achieve improvements in on-site water quality, downstream water quality, fisheries, wildlife, and plant growth.”

“And we feel that, in the long run, it will be less expensive than through the traditional methods of cleanup.”

George Chalfant (606) 745-3147

Issued November 23, 1990

#

## **NATIONAL HEARING ON FEDERAL MILK ORDERS CONCLUDES**

WASHINGTON, Nov. 26—The U.S. Department of Agriculture has concluded 43 days of testimony on a national hearing on possible changes in pricing provisions of federal milk marketing orders. The hearing began Sept. 5 in Eau Claire, Wis., and concluded Nov. 20 in Irving, Texas.

Over 10,000 pages of testimony were taken from 195 witnesses, who, as part of their testimony, furnished 233 exhibits.

A complete transcript of the hearing is being compiled, to be available by mid-December to the public for inspection at the 16 federal milk marketing order offices in the United States as well as the office of USDA's hearing clerk in Washington, D.C.

Briefs, based on the hearing record and postmarked or courier-dated no later than April 13, 1991, may be filed with USDA's hearing clerk, Rm. 1083-S, 14th St. and Independence Ave., Washington, D.C. 20250; tel. (202) 447-4483. Paul N. Kane, USDA's administrative law judge presiding over the hearing, has allowed parties to file replies to the briefs with USDA's hearing clerk by April 27.

After April 27, USDA will evaluate the evidence and briefs, preparing a recommendation, or “recommended decision,” to be published in the Federal Register, and on which the public may comment. Based on the comments received, USDA then will prepare a final position, or “final rule,” on the pricing provisions of federal milk marketing orders. Any changes that rule might propose would be contingent on referendums in each milk marketing area a proposal would affect.



There are currently 42 separate federal milk marketing orders nationwide, which adjust supplies of milk with the needs of consumers and milk product manufacturers.

Addresses and telephone numbers of the milk marketing offices are:

Arizona—5501 N. 19th Ave., Suite 230, Phoenix, 85015; tel. (602) 246-7811;

Florida—7457 Aloma Ave., Winter Park, 32792; tel. (407) 678-3511;

Georgia—North Gate Office Park, Suite 109, 3610 Dekalb Technology Parkway,

Doraville, 30340; tel. (404) 455-6323;

Illinois—800 Roosevelt Rd., Bldg. A., Suite 200, Glen Ellyn 60137; tel. (708) 858-8400;

Kansas—7819 Conser Place, Overland Park, 66204; tel. (913) 648-1050;

Kentucky—3920 Bardstown Rd., Louisville 40218-0030; tel. (502) 499-0040;

Massachusetts—30 Winter St., 8th Flr., Boston 02108; tel. (617) 542-8966;

Michigan—2684 West Eleven Mile Rd., Berkley 48072; tel. (313) 548-1603;

Minnesota—4570 W. 77th St., Suite 210, Minneapolis; tel. (612) 831-5292;

Missouri—2550 Schuetz Rd., Maryland Heights, 63043-3393; tel. (314) 567-4730;

New York—708 Third Ave., 6th Flr., New York 10017-4101; tel. (212) 309-1600;

Ohio—5950 Sharon Woods Blvd., Columbus 43229; tel. (614) 891-1851;

Oklahoma—5323 S. Lewis Ave.; Tulsa 74105; tel. (918) 742-0415;

Texas—1404 Carroll St., Carrollton 75006; tel. (214) 245-6060;

Virginia—333 N. Fairfax St., Essex Bldg., Suite 200, Alexandria, 22314; tel. (703) 549-7000;

Washington—16 W. Harrison St., Seattle 98119; tel. (206) 282-1664.

Further information on the national hearing on federal milk orders is available from the Dairy Division, Order Formulation Branch, USDA, AMS, Rm. 2971-S, P.O. Box 96456, Washington, D.C. 20090-6456; tel. (202) 447-6273.

Carolyn Coutts (202) 447-8998.

#



## FUNGUS GETS EPA APPROVAL AS NEW BIOCONTROL FOR TWO SERIOUS PLANT DISEASES

WASHINGTON, Nov. 26—A naturally occurring beneficial fungus was approved by the Environmental Protection Agency last week as a new biological control for two plant diseases.

A strain of *Gliocladium virens*, discovered and researched in U.S. Department of Agriculture laboratories, has been approved as a greenhouse biological control for two diseases that cost growers more than \$1 billion a year. It is the first biocontrol fungus approved to control a plant disease in the United States.

The USDA's Agricultural Research Service invented and patented technology for formulating the *Gliocladium* into easily applied pellets. W.R. Grace & Co. was granted an exclusive licence by ARS for its use, and then, in cooperation with ARS scientists, has further developed the technology.

"Grace hopes to have a product on the market in two years," said Francois P. van Remoortere, president of the Grace Research Division.

The two fungi, *Rhizoctonia solani* and *Pythium ultimum*, cause diseases called "damping off," which rots seeds, seedlings and cuttings.

"Almost any seed or seedling is vulnerable to attack" by these fungi, which can destroy 10 to 30 percent of a crop, said Robert D. Lumsden, plant pathologist with the federal research agency.

Among damping off's victims: geraniums, snapdragons, chrysanthemums, celosia, poinsettias, cotton, corn, beans and soybeans.

In tests done by Lumsden and ARS plant pathologist James C. Locke, *Gliocladium* reduced—by 80 to 95 percent—plant loss caused by the fungi, results similar to those obtained with chemical fungicides.

The scientists hope that, by selecting better strains of the fungus or improving the nutrients in the pellet, the biocontrol can consistently reduce damage by 95 to 100 percent.

Today's approval allows *Gliocladium*'s use on any plants grown in a greenhouse—including ornamentals and edibles like tomatoes, cabbage or broccoli. Grace may seek registration for outdoor use of the biocontrol fungus, as markets open up, according to van Remoortere.

Resembling granular fertilizer, the pellets are made of dormant fungal spores, wheat bran and alginate—a natural gel-like material that binds the particle together.

When the pellets are moistened, the spores germinate and the fungus multiplies and controls the disease.

*Gliocladium* is a naturally occurring organism that was isolated from Maryland soil by scientists at Beltsville's Biocontrol of Plant Diseases Laboratory in the early 1980's.

Chemist William J. Connick, Jr., with an ARS laboratory in New Orleans, La., originally developed the alginate pellet formulation to encapsulate herbicides to kill weeds on top of the soil.

Soil scientist Jack A. Lewis and plant pathologists George C. Papavizas and Deborah Fravel, all at Beltsville, were awarded ARS patents for their part in adapting the alginate process for biocontrol fungi in the soil.

"One of the keys to making this product effective involved mass producing the fungus and formulating it into pellets," said James F. Walter, manager of biochemical engineering at the Grace Washington Research Center in Columbia, Md. This product represents the first in a series of biological control agents being developed by Grace in collaboration with ARS.

Jessica Morrison Silva (301) 344-3927

#

## **YEUTTER ANNOUNCES 45 WATER QUALITY PROJECTS**

WASHINGTON, Nov. 26—Secretary of Agriculture Clayton Yeutter today announced that the U.S. Department of Agriculture will implement 45 new projects in 34 states in fiscal 1991 to accelerate improvement of water quality in agricultural areas.

Yeutter said that these newly designated projects, along with 45 begun last year, provide on-farm assistance to farmers under the administration's water quality initiative.

Of the 45 new projects, eight are designed to demonstrate that, given encouragement to adopt cost-effective agricultural practices, farmers and ranchers can achieve area-wide improvement and protection of water quality. The goal is to accelerate adoption of water quality technology in these project areas and to gain experience that will be useful in extending program activities into other areas.



The remaining 37 projects are designed to make specific improvements in water quality in selected agricultural watersheds, called hydrologic unit areas. The goal is to provide farmers and ranchers with the educational, technical and financial means to respond voluntarily to onfarm and offsite environmental concerns and related state water quality requirements.

The five-year projects will be implemented under the leadership of USDA’s Soil Conservation Service, Cooperative Extension Service, and Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service. Funding beyond fiscal 1991 will be contingent upon subsequent appropriations.

The project selections, based on state requests, were made by the Education and Technical Assistance Committee of USDA’s Water Quality Working Group. The committee includes representatives from eight USDA agencies as well as the Environmental Protection Agency, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the U.S. Geological Survey. The National Association of Conservation Districts and the National Association of Soil Conservation Administrators were asked for their comments during the selection process.

The 45 projects are listed below. An asterisk marks the eight demonstration projects; the remainder are hydrologic unit areas.

State	Project Name	Counties
1. Alabama	Ryan-Crooked-Rock Creeks	Cullman, Winston
2. Arizona	West Maricopa	Maricopa
3. Arkansas	*Millwood Lake	Hempstead, Howard, Little River, Polk, Sevier
4. Arkansas	Long Creek	Carroll, Boone
5. California	Morro Bay	San Luis Obispo
6. California	West Stanislaus	Stanislaus
7. Colorado	Patterson Hollow	Otero, Pueblo
8. Colorado	*San Luis Valley	Alamosa, Conejos, Costilla, Rio Grande Saguache
9. Connecticut	Scantic River	Tolland, Hartford
10. Florida	Karst Cropland	Jackson

11. Florida	Lake Apopka Drainage Basin	Orange, Lake
12. Georgia	*Gum Creek	Crisp, Dooly
13. Georgia	Little River- Rooty Creek	Jasper, Morgan, Newton, Putnam, Walton
14. Hawaii	Kaiaka-Waialua	Honolulu
15. Idaho	Snake-Payette Rivers	Adams, Canyon, Gem, Payette Washington
16. Idaho	*Snake River Plain	Blaine, Cassia, Jerome, Lincoln, Minidoka, Oneida, Power, Twin Falls Champaign, Edgar, Vermilion
17. Illinois	Little Vermilion River	La Porte, Marshall, St. Joseph
18. Indiana	Upper Kankakee River	Allamakee, Clayton, Fayette, Winnesheik
19. Iowa	*Northeast Iowa River	Union, Adair
20. Iowa	Three Mile Creek	Clayton
21. Iowa	Sny Magill Creek	Nemaha, Brown
22. Kansas	Webster Creek	Anderson, Boyle, Mercer, Nelson, Shelby, Spencer
23. Kentucky	Taylorsville Lake- Upper Salt River	
24. Maryland	German Branch	Queen Anne
25. Massachusetts	Wachusett Reservoir	Franklin, Hampshire, Worcester
26. Michigan	Wolf Creek	Lenawee
27. Michigan	*Saginaw Bay	Bay, Huron, Saginaw, Tuscola
28. Missouri	Upper Niangua	Dallas, Laclede, Webster



29. Nebraska	Central Blue Valley	Gage, Jefferson, Saline
30. New Hampshire	Upper Connecticut River	Grafton
31. New Jersey	Great Swamp	Morris, Somerset
32. New York	*Wallkill-Rondout	Orange, Sullivan, Ulster
33. Ohio	Darby Creek	Champaign, Franklin, Logan, Madison, Union, Pickaway
34. Oklahoma	Peacheater Creek	Adair
35. Oregon	Tualatin River-Dairy-McKay	Washington
36. Pennsylvania	Pequea-Mill Creeks	Lancaster
37. South Carolina	Lake Bowen	Greenville, Spartanburg
38. South Dakota	*Big Sioux Aquifer	Brookings, Moody, Minnehaha
39. South Dakota	Lower Rapid Creek	Pennington
40. Tennessee	Beaver Creek	Fayette, Tipton, Shelby, Haywood
41. Texas	Seymour Aquifer	Haskell, Knox
42. Texas	Lake Fork Creek	Hopkins, Rains, Wood
43. Utah	Otter Creek-Koosharem	Piute, Sevier
44. Virginia	Blackwater River	Franklin
45. Washington	Granger Drain	Yakima
		Diana Morse (202) 447-4772

## USDA ANNOUNCES PREVAILING WORLD MARKET RICE PRICES

WASHINGTON, Nov. 27—Under Secretary of Agriculture Richard T. Crowder today announced the prevailing world market prices of milled rice, loan rate basis, as follows:

- long grain whole kernels, 8.28 cents per pound;
- medium grain whole kernels, 7.32 cents per pound;
- short grain whole kernels, 7.27 cents per pound;
- broken kernels, 4.14 cents per pound.

Based upon these prevailing world market prices for milled rice, rough rice world prices are estimated to be:

- long grain, \$5.20 per hundredweight;
- medium grain, \$4.72 per hundredweight;
- short grain, \$4.70 per hundredweight.

The prices announced are effective today at 3 p.m. EST. The next scheduled price announcement will be made Dec. 4, at 3 p.m. EST, although prices may be announced sooner if warranted.

Gene Rosera (202) 447-7923

#

## “NOSY” BEAGLE BLOCKS FORBIDDEN FRUIT MAILED FROM HAWAII

WASHINGTON—How do you keep packages of fresh Hawaiian fruit that could contain agricultural pests from reaching the U.S. mainland—while safeguarding the privacy of people who use first-class mail?

That was the challenge recently faced by the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. Their solution? Call in the dogs!

Not just any dogs, mind you, but specially trained beagles like Doc Watson. He’s a member of the APHIS Beagle Brigade, dog teams that sniff passenger luggage at airports throughout the country to identify fruits, meats and other agricultural items that are forbidden entry into the United States. Now Doc is showing off a new skill—detecting contraband fruit inside parcels at the U.S. Post Office in Honolulu.

Congress passed the Agricultural Quarantine Act in 1989 specifically to prohibit the mailing of forbidden fruit. To enforce the law, however,



APHIS had to ask a U.S. District Court in Honolulu to issue criminal warrants to search suspect parcels.

Because the court could not issue a warrant based solely on the suspicious appearance of a package, APHIS officials had to prove that trained beagles could identify forbidden fruit inside closed containers by scent. In fact, the dogs attained an accuracy of 90 percent or better, which was considered adequate legal cause by the court to issue search warrants for first-class packages, said APHIS Administrator James W. Glosser.

Plant pests pose a serious threat to agriculture on the U.S. mainland. Over the past decade, California and Florida have experienced recurrent infestations of Mediterranean fruit fly, a pest of more than 250 crops, including citrus. These Medfly outbreaks have cost taxpayers more than \$200 million in eradication costs alone, not counting the losses that occur when areas must be quarantined and producers cannot market their products to other states or countries, Glosser said.

For decades APHIS has maintained a quarantine on Hawaiian fruit going to the mainland, covering both commercial shipments and products carried by private individuals. Agency officials have long suspected that the quarantine was being circumvented by packages sent through first-class mail. To determine if this suspicion was correct, APHIS and the U.S. Postal Service began a pilot program in May 1990 to inspect first-class mail for prohibited agricultural products.

Here's how Doc Watson fits into the inspection routine. APHIS inspectors select mainland-bound packages that look suspicious and placed them alongside similar parcels not believed to contain contraband. At that point, Doc Watson is called in to sniff out suspects. He is trained specifically to respond to the scents of mango, litchi, soursop, citrus, avocado and guava, the main carriers of exotic fruit flies.

Doc's response is passive—when he “hits” on a package that contains forbidden fruit, he merely sits down quietly beside it. Then he looks up to his handler, Michael Simon, for his reward—praise and a couple of dog hams biscuits.

After suspicious packages have been identified, inspectors prepare forms certifying that each was singled out by Doc Watson. The court then issues search warrants for the packages.

Warrants in hand, inspectors open the packages, remove the contraband, reseal the remains, and send them on to their destination. The addressee is not held responsible but does receive a notice stating

what was removed. The sender bears responsibility for the violation and receives a citation and a \$250 fine. If the fine is contested, a hearing can be held, and the penalty can be increased—up to \$1,000. Because evidence of wrongdoing is so well-recorded, most senders just pay the fine.

Throughout the pilot program, Doc Watson has demonstrated virtually 100-percent accuracy. As of Oct. 31, the beagle had sniffed out 477 illegal parcels of produce. The total take weighed in at 4,229 pounds, and included 177 interceptions of fruit flies, foreign weeds, diseases and other exotic pests. Forty-five interceptions of Mediterranean, Oriental and melon fruit flies were made.

Some fruits sniffed out by Doc Watson are small—a few miniature 51 oranges mailed with other goods. Some finds are huge, like a 30-pound jackfruit that outweighed Doc by about 10 pounds. From a quarantine standpoint, illegal fruit is dangerous regardless of its size. Even one miniature orange can carry enough larvae, or maggots, to start a new fruit fly infestation on the mainland.

Caree Lawrence (301) 436-7280

Issued: Nov. 28, 1990

#

## **USDA PROPOSES REVISING STANDARDS FOR BULK AMERICAN CHEESE**

WASHINGTON, Nov. 28—The U.S. Department of Agriculture is proposing several changes to its standards for grades of “American cheese” packaged in bulk containers of over 100 pounds (and normally between 500 and 640 pounds) to reflect developments in cheesemaking technology.

American cheese is a term for four varieties of hard cheese made in the United States—cheddar, colby, washed curd and granular cheese.

Daniel D. Haley, administrator of USDA’s Agricultural Marketing Service, said these are the first proposed changes in the standards since they were established in 1971.

The changes would:

—permit use of U.S. Food and Drug Administration-approved mold-inhibitors (antimycotics) on the surface of the bulk cheese to give it longer storage life;



—establish two new subcategories, “long-hold” and “short hold,” of the “Extra grade,” the highest grade of American cheese, with criteria for the new subcategories to reflect properties like acidity and compactness of the cheese curd, which are predictive of successful storage, and with “long- hold” to apply to cheese to be stored over four months;

—add the criteria “flat” and “rancid” to the group of flavors used in deciding American cheese qualities;

—redefine packaging requirements for USDA-graded American cheese in order to reflect changes in packaging technology since the grades were established.

The changes were proposed to give USDA cheese graders more guidance in identifying cheese with the best keeping qualities for long-term storage and to adjust the standards to modern cheesemaking technology, Haley said. The proposal reflects the interests of USDA’s Commodity Credit Corporation (a major purchaser of bulk American cheese under the federal dairy price support program), as well as the interests of the National Cheese Institute, which USDA consulted in drafting the proposals.

The proposed changes will appear as a proposed rule in the Nov. 29 Federal Register. Comments, postmarked no later than Dec. 31 should be sent to the director, Dairy Division, AMS, USDA, Rm. 2968-S, P.O. Box 96456, Washington, D.C. 20090-6456. Copies of the proposal are available from that office; tel. (202) 447-4392.

Carolyn Coutts (202) 447-8998

#

## **USDA RELEASES COST OF FOOD AT HOME FOR OCTOBER**

WASHINGTON, Nov. 28—Here is the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s monthly update of the weekly cost of food at home for October 1990:

Cost of food at home for a week in October 1990

	-----Food plans-----			
	(In Dollars)			
	Thrifty	Low-cost	Moderate cost	Liberal
Families:				
Family of 2 (20-50 years)	47.80	60.40	74.30	92.10
Family of 2 (51 years and over)	45.40	57.90	71.30	85.30
Family of 4 with preschool children	69.80	87.10	106.00	130.00
Family of 4 with elemen- tary schoolchildren	79.80	102.20	127.50	153.50
Individuals in four-person families:				
Children:				
1-2 years	12.70	15.40	17.90	21.60
3-5 years	13.60	16.80	20.60	24.70
6-8 years	16.60	22.10	27.70	32.30
9-11 years	19.70	25.20	32.30	37.50
Females:				
12-19 years	20.70	24.70	29.90	36.20
20-50 years	20.70	25.70	31.10	39.70
51 and over	20.50	24.90	30.70	36.70
Males:				
12-14 years	20.60	28.50	35.60	41.80
15-19 years	21.40	29.50	36.60	42.40
20-50 years	22.80	29.20	36.40	44.00
51 and over	20.80	27.70	34.10	40.80

USDA's Human Nutrition Information Service computes the cost of food at home for four food plans—thrifty, low-cost, moderate-cost and liberal.

Sue Ann Ritchko, HNIS administrator, said the plans consist of foods that provide well-balanced meals and snacks for a week.

In computing the costs, USDA assumes all food is bought at the store and prepared at home. Costs do not include alcoholic beverages, pet food, soap, cigarettes, paper goods and other nonfood items bought at the store.

“USDA costs are only guides to spending,” Ritchko said. “Families may spend more or less, depending on such factors as where they buy their food, how carefully they plan and buy, whether some food is produced at home, what foods the family likes, and how much food is prepared at home.”

“Most families will find the moderate-cost or low-cost plan suitable,” she said. “The thrifty plan, which USDA uses to set the coupon allotment in the food stamp program, is for families who have tighter budgets. Families with unlimited resources might use the liberal plan.”

To use the chart to estimate your family's food costs:

—For members eating all meals at home—or carried from home—use the amounts shown in the chart.

—For members eating some meals out, deduct 5 percent from the amount shown for each meal not eaten at home. Thus, for a person eating lunch out 5 days a week, subtract 25 percent, or one-fourth the cost shown.

—For guests, add 5 percent of the amount shown for the proper age group for each meal.

Costs in the second part of the chart are for individuals in four- person families. If your family has more or less than four, total the “individual” figures and make these adjustments, because larger families tend to buy and use food more economically than smaller ones:

—For a one-person family, add 20 percent.

—For a two-person family, add 10 percent.

—For a three-person family, add 5 percent.

—For a five- or six-person family, subtract 5 percent.

—For a family of seven or more, subtract 10 percent.



Details of the four family food plans are available from the Nutrition Education Division, HNIS, USDA, Federal Building, Hyattsville, Md. 20782.

Johna Pierce (301) 436-8617

#

**THIS WEEK'S HONEY-LOAN REPAYMENT LEVELS  
UNCHANGED**

WASHINGTON, Nov. 29—Producers may repay their 1989 honey price-support loans at the following levels, according to Keith D. Bjerke, executive vice president of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Commodity Credit Corporation:

**Weekly Honey-loan Repayment Levels, color and class, cents per pound, 1989 crop Table**

White .....	40.0
Extra-light Amber .....	37.0
Light Amber .....	36.0
Amber .....	35.0
Nontable .....	33.0

The weekly repayment level for 1990-crop honey is 44.0 cents per pound for all colors, table and nontable grades.

Levels are unchanged from those announced last week.

Producers who redeem their honey pledged as loan collateral by repaying their honey-price support loans at these levels may not repledge the same honey as collateral for another loan.

Jane K. Phillips (202) 447-7601

John C. Ryan (202) 447-8207

#





